

MURAKAMI, Akira  
Appl. No. 10/058,236  
September 24, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application and entry of this Amendment are solicited. Claims 1-13 will remain active in the application subsequent to entry of this Amendment.

It is proposed to amend each of independent claims 1-4 to recite the presence of a sleeve member associated with the upper mold member and the lower mold member and to also positively recite that the glass in a softened state is press molded without causing any surrounding edge portion of the blank being produced to come into contact with the mold or either of the mold sleeves. Basis for these amendments will appear from the description of the invention throughout the specification and in particular Figures 2A and 2B and the associated discussion in paragraph [0029]. Entry of this Amendment is appropriate as it serves to further define the claims, advance examination and address issues raised in the outstanding Official Action.

Claims 1-3 and 6-10 stand rejected as being anticipated by Murakami et al JP 10-236831 for which the examiner relies upon U.S. 6,442,975 as an equivalent of the JP citation.

In the arguments offered in the Official Action in support of this rejection on page 6 the examiner refers to a third mold member, namely mold sleeves as not being mentioned in applicant's claims. The above amendments proposed to claims 1-4 respond to this observation and in fact follow the comments suggested in the Official Action.

In the Office Action, page 6, lines 1 to 6, the Examiner states "While applicant may argue that the 'free surface' includes no contact between the sleeves of the mold as done in the prior art, said limitation is neither claimed nor included by the definition of a 'free surface'. The definition of a 'free surface' does not exclude the possible contact between sleeves of the mold but merely requires that the mold surface of the molds not contact the surrounding edge of the blank, which as shown above is already taught in the prior art."

Applicant believe the examiner's comments to be misguided, particularly when considered in light of the amendments to claims 1-4.

The Examiner would appear to indicate that a mold of the applied reference consists of an upper mold member and a lower mold member. However, a mold can also consist of an upper mold member, a lower mold member and a sleeve. When the Examiner states that "As shown in Figure 10 the circumferential edge of glass blank 44 does not touch the mold dies 17 and 14 as it

MURAKAMI, Akira  
Appl. No. 10/058,236  
September 24, 2004

is being pressed formed”, the Examiner seems to simply exclude the presence of a sleeve from the mold.

When the Examiner refers to the definition of “free surface”, the Examiner seems to understand that the molding surface is defined only by an upper mold member and/or a lower mold member. However, for example, if a molded article has a side surface as a positional reference, and if the side surface as a positional reference is defined by an upper mold member, a lower mold member or a sleeve, then the sleeve should have a molding surface in the last case. This is believed to be common knowledge in this art.

Applicant's specification, page 3, last line to page 4, line 9, says that “In the method of defining the surrounding edge portion of an intermediate with a mold, ... heat is conducted from the surrounding edge portion to the mold...”. Thus if it is correct that the “As shown in Figure 10 the circumferential edge of glass blank 44 does not touch the mold dies 17 and 14 as it is being pressed formed” (so that a free surface is formed) as the Examiner states, it is impossible to explain how heat can be conducted from the surrounding edge portion to the mold (mold dies 17 and 14) in the Murakami reference without also conducting heat from the surrounding edge first to the sleeve, since the surrounding edge portion is in contact directly with the sleeve (which the present specification describes as a mold).

When it is argued that “The definition of a ‘free surface’ does not exclude the possible contact between sleeves of the mold but merely requires that the mold surface of the molds not contact the surrounding edge of the blank”, this conflicts with applicant's explanation of “free surface” in Paragraph [0021] of the present specification. That is, paragraph [0021] of applicant's specification also describes that “when the above surrounding edge portion is not defined, the surrounding edge portion forms a free surface”. This is also part of the definition. If the surrounding edge portion comes into contact with a sleeve or sleeves, that is, if the definition of a ‘free surface’ does not exclude the possible contact between sleeves of the mold as the Examiner states, it is not possible to understand that “when the above surrounding edge portion is not defined, the surrounding edge portion forms a free surface”. In other words, if possible contact between sleeves exists be there, the surrounding edge portion cannot form any free surface, since the surrounding edge portion is defined.

MURAKAMI, Akira  
Appl. No. 10/058,236  
September 24, 2004

For the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application as above amended define allowable subject matter. Reconsideration, entry of this Amendment and allowance are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Arthur R. Crawford  
Reg. No. 25,327

ARC:eaw  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100